

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-10 and 12-21 are all the claims pending in the application.

### **I. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

A. Claims 1, 10 and 21 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Fujinami et al. (U.S. 5,568,274).

Claim 1 recites the features of a matching status information outputter operable to detect whether a sequence of input code is a part of the packet start code, and to output the detection result as matching status information; and a data formatter operable to output predetermined data in accordance with the matching status information when the sequence of input code is judged not to be a part of the packet start code but to be a part of a particular sequence of coded data, and not to output predetermined data when the sequence of input code is judged to be a part of the packet start code. Applicants respectfully submit that Fujinami does not disclose or suggest the above-noted combination of features.

In particular, with respect to the above-noted features, Applicants note that in the Response to Arguments section of the Office Action, the Examiner has indicated that the output of the header separation circuit 22 of Fujinami corresponds to the claimed “matching status information” (see Office Action at page 2). Thus, as the Examiner has indicated that the output of the header separation circuit 22 is the “matching status information”, it is clear that the Examiner is taking the position that the header separation circuit 22 corresponds to the claimed “matching status information outputter”.

However, Applicants note that in the Response to Arguments section of the Office Action, the Examiner has also explicitly stated that the header separation circuit 22 corresponds to the claimed “data formatter” (see Office Action at page 2). Thus, the Examiner has taken the position that the header separation circuit 22 of Fujinami corresponds to both of the claimed “matching status information outputter” and “data formatter”. Applicants respectfully submit that such a position is clearly improper.

For example, Applicants note that because the matching status information outputter outputs a detection result as matching status information, and the data formatter is operable to output predetermined data in accordance with the matching status information, Applicants respectfully submit that it is simply not possible that the header separation circuit 22 of Fujinami could correspond to both of the claimed “matching status information outputter” and “data formatter”.

In addition, regarding the claimed “predetermined data”, Applicants note that in the Office Action, the Examiner has indicated that various stream ID values in Fig. 4 of Fujinami correspond to the claimed “predetermined data”, but has also indicated that the “predetermined data” corresponds to the data output from the header separation circuit 22 to the control circuit 24 (see Office Action at pages 2-3). Accordingly, Applicants kindly request that the Examiner clarify which data of Fujinami is being interpreted as the “predetermined data”.

In this regard, if the Examiner takes the position that the “predetermined data” corresponds to the various stream ID values in Fig. 4 of Fujinami, Applicants respectfully note that the output of such stream ID values is not in any way whatsoever dependent upon whether or not a sequence of input code is judged to be a part of a packet start code. As such, Applicants

submit that Fujinami does not disclose or suggest a data formatter operable to output predetermined data in accordance with the matching status information when the sequence of input code is judged not to be a part of the packet start code but to be a part of a particular sequence of coded data, and not to output predetermined data when the sequence of input code is judged to be a part of the packet start code.

Moreover, if the Examiner takes the position that the output from the header separation circuit 22 to the control circuit 24 corresponds to the claimed “predetermined data”, Applicants respectfully point out to the Examiner that the data which is output from the header separation circuit 22 to the control circuit 24 is described as being pack headers, packet headers and entry packets (see col. 15, lines 13-16).

Thus, in Fujinami, because the data that is output from the header separation circuit 22 to the control circuit 24 are pack headers, packet headers and entry packets, Applicants respectfully submit that Fujinami clearly does not disclose or suggest a data formatter operable to output predetermined data in accordance with the matching status information when the sequence of input code is judged not to be a part of the packet start code but to be a part of a particular sequence of coded data, and not to output predetermined data when the sequence of input code is judged to be a part of the packet start code.

Further, Applicants note that claim 1 has been amended herein so as to recite that the particular sequence of coded data and the packet start code have the same prefix code consisting of plural bytes. Applicants respectfully submit that Fujinami does not disclose or suggest such a feature.

Regarding the above-noted feature, Applicants note that it appears as though the Examiner is somehow taking the position that the stream ID values shown in Fig. 4 of Fujinami correspond to the claimed “particular sequence of coded data” and the claimed “packet start code” (see the Office Action at page 4 in which the Examiner has relied on Fig. 4 of Fujinami for the “particular sequence of coded data” and the “packet start code” having similar patterns).

With respect to such a position, Applicants note that claim 1 has been further clarified herein by replacing the phrase “similar patterns” with the phrase “the same prefix code consisting of plural bytes”. In this regard, Applicants respectfully submit that the stream ID values shown in Fig. 4 of Fujinami do not correspond to the claimed “particular sequence of coded data” and the claimed “packet start code”, and as such, that Fujinami clearly does not disclose or suggest the feature recited in amended claim 1 which indicates that “the particular sequence of coded data and the packet start code have the same prefix code consisting of plural bytes”.

If the Examiner disagrees, Applicants kindly request that the Examiner explicitly identify the data in Fujinami that is being relied upon as corresponding to the claimed “particular sequence of coded data”, the claimed “packet start code”, and the claimed “prefix code consisting of plural bytes”.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that Fujinami does not disclose, suggest or otherwise render obvious all of the features recited in claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable over Fujinami, an indication of which is kindly requested. Claims 10 and 21 depend from claim 1 and are therefore considered patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

## **II. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

A. Claims 5 and 15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujinami et al. (US 5,568,274) in view of Toyohara (U.S. 5,768,265).

Claims 5 and 15 depend from claim 1. Applicants submit that Toyohara fails to cure the deficiencies of Fujinami et al., as discussed above, with respect to claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 5 and 15 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

B. Claims 8, 9 and 18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujinami et al. (US 5,568,274) in view of Yanagihara et al. (U.S. 6,172,989), and further in view of Movshovich et al. (U.S. 6,359,911).

Claim 8 recites the feature of a formatter operable to pad a data bus with a predetermined number of pseudo data so that the code sequence indicating the end of the coded data is forwarded to the next stage of pipeline. In the Office Action, the Examiner has taken the position that Movshovich discloses at col. 11, lines 25-30 that padding data is added so that the code sequence indicating the end of coded data is forwarded to the next stage of pipeline (see Office Action at page 7). Applicants respectfully disagree.

In particular, Applicants note that col. 11, lines 25-30 of Movshovich indicates that the “local header serves a variety of purposes, including generating IEEE-1394 enable information, generating time stamp information for IEEE-1394 support, providing matched PID location information, [and] padding the packets to align bytes to the memory controller’s natural boundary (burst transfer)” (emphasis added).

Based on the above-noted disclosure, Applicants respectfully submit that the padding data of Movshovich is clearly not utilized so that the code sequence indicating the end of the coded data is forwarded to the next stage of pipeline (as recited in claim 8), but instead, is merely utilized to align bytes to the memory controller's natural boundary.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that Movshovich does not disclose, suggest or otherwise render obvious the use of padding data that is added so that the code sequence indicating the end of coded data is forwarded to the next stage of pipeline. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that neither Fujinami nor Yanagihara cures this deficiency of Movshovich.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited prior art references do not teach, suggest or otherwise render obvious the above-noted feature of a formatter operable to pad a data bus with a predetermined number of pseudo data so that the code sequence indicating the end of the coded data is forwarded to the next stage of pipeline, as recited in claim 8.

Thus, Applicants submit that claim 8 is patentable over the cited prior art, an indication of which is kindly requested. Claims 9 and 18 depend from claim 8 and are therefore considered patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

### **III. Allowable Subject Matter**


Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating that claims 2-4, 6, 7, 12-14, 16 and 7 contain allowable subject matter and would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

#### **IV. Conclusion**

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Ryoji YAMAGUCHI et al.

By:   
Kenneth W. Fields  
Registration No. 52,430  
Attorney for Applicants

KWF/krq  
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021  
Telephone (202) 721-8200  
Facsimile (202) 721-8250  
December 11, 2008